## REMARKS

Amendments to claims 1, 3, 17, 19, and 32 are for the purpose of clarifying what Applicants regard as the invention.

### I. CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,598,012 (Berry) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,708,825 (Sotomayor).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the following claim elements: receiving a trace comprising a trace string over a network, the trace associated with a first trace log; parsing the first trace; generating a new version of the trace that is capable of navigating to a corresponding trace in a second trace log. Neither Berry, Sotomayor nor the combination of Berry and Sotomayor disclose or suggest such a limitation.

Berry teaches a system for compensating for output overhead in trace data by analyzing and compensating for the overhead associated with outputting trace information. The approach of Berry parses individual trace strings within a first trace log without analyzing a second trace log to identify corresponding traces. The "trace record to parse" referred to by the Examiner in Berry (col. 18, line 34) consists of reading a *single* "trace text file" containing trace strings (col. 18, lines 16). The data parsed is then used to "profile the performance characteristics" of the program (col. 19, lines 6-8). Berry does not analyze *two or more* trace logs simultaneously during parsing to identify corresponding traces.

Sotomayor teaches a method that enables scanning one or more documents, automatically identifies significant key topics, concepts, and phrases in the documents, and creates summary pages for, and hyperlinks between, some or all of these key topics. Sotomayor cannot hyperlink corresponding traces because neither it nor Berry is capable of identifying communications operation relationships between traces. Sotomayor indiscriminately "identifies significant key topics ... and hyperlinks between these key topics." A "semantic analyzer program," as used in Sotomayor (col. 4, line 24), is not capable of identifying corresponding traces because it only looks for semantical similarities between topics (col. 37, line 20), not navigational relationships between traces.

7

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Berry in view of Sotomayor. For at least these same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 3, 17, 19, and 32 and their respective dependent claims are likewise allowable.

## CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is believed to be warranted and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7011402001**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. **50-2518,** referencing billing number **7011402001**.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: _____

By: _____
Peter C. Mei
Registration No. 39,768

Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067
Telephone: (650) 849-4870
Telefax: (650) 849-4800